	Case 1:23-cv-00671-KES-SAB Doc	cument 62	Filed 09/22/25	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	ISIDRO ROMAN,	No	o. 1:23-cv-00671-K	ES-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,		RDER ADOPTING	
13	v.	DI	RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	
14	K. JACKSON		ocs. 47, 55	
15	Defendant.		JCS. 47, 33	
16				
17	Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42			
18	U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.			
19	§ 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.			
20	On May 8, 2025, defendant filed a motion for summary judgment on the grounds that			
21	plaintiff did not submit a grievance relating to the allegations at issue in this action and thus			
22	plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. Doc. 47. Plaintiff opposed the motion for			
23	summary judgment. Doc. 51. On July 11, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings			
24	and recommendations recommending that defendant's motion for summary judgment for failure			
25	to exhaust administrative remedies be granted. Doc. 55. The findings and recommendations			
26	were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within			
27	fourteen (14) days of service. <i>Id.</i> at 9. Plaintiff filed objections on July 28, 2025, and defendants			
28	filed a reply on August 8, 2025. Docs. 56, 57.			
		1		

Case 1:23-cv-00671-KES-SAB Document 62 Filed 09/22/25 Page 2 of 2

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court conducted a de novo review of this matter. In his objections, plaintiff does not challenge the finding that he did not file a grievance regarding the retaliation claim at issue in this action. Liberally construed, his two-page objection argues generally that his ability to file a grievance was hindered and that his claims should proceed to trial. Doc. 56. However, plaintiff fails to show how his ability to file a grievance relating to the retaliation claim was hindered, particularly when plaintiff filed three other grievances, on other distinct issues, relating to defendant.

Having carefully reviewed the file, including plaintiff's objections and defendant's reply, the Court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

Accordingly,

- 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 11, 2025, Doc. 55, are adopted in full;
- 2. Defendant's motion for summary judgment, Doc. 47, is granted; and
- 3. This action is dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to exhaust the administrative remedies.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 21, 2025

HNITED STATES DISTRICT HDGE